



Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 26 February 2026

by Alison Scott (BA Hons) Dip TP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 6 March 2026

Appeal Ref: APP/M5450/D/25/3374876

52 Durley Avenue, Pinner HA5 1JH

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) against a refusal to grant approval required under Article 3(1) and Schedule 2, Part 1 Class A.1 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 (as amended).
 - The appeal is made by Mr and Mrs Paterson against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Harrow.
 - The application Ref is PL/1697/25.
 - The development proposed is Single-storey rear extension with flat roof and lantern roof lights.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. Prior Approval Class A of Part 1 of Schedule 2 of the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England) Order 2015 as amended, permits the enlargement, improvement or other alteration of a dwellinghouse. Under Class A.1 development is not permitted if certain criteria apply.
3. The appellant applied for prior approval to erect a rear extension to the dwelling house to extend from the rear elevation by four meters the full width of the dwelling.

Main Issue

4. The main issue is whether or not the proposal falls within the limitations of permitted development.

Reasons

5. The proposed extension would be constructed over the existing raised patio to the rear of the dwelling. The side wall of the extension would be located adjacent to the common boundary with the adjoining semi-detached house. Although the eaves height of the extension immediately adjacent to the adjoining house has been shown as 3m on the submitted drawings, these drawings also show that at the southern side, the side wall of the extension is built off the lower ground level indicating that it projects beyond the current extent of the raised patio. As a result, the eaves height at this point is in excess of 3m.
6. Therefore, it would not comply with the limitation set out in Paragraph A1(i) of Part 1, Class A of Schedule 2 to the GPDO which restricts the eaves height of

extensions to 3 metres where the enlarged part of the dwellinghouse would be within 2 metres of the boundary of the curtilage.

7. The development also includes a raised patio, or platform, incorporating steps that would be located adjacent to the end wall of the extension and which the appellant states is not part of the proposal. It would also facilitate access to the garden area. Whilst this is not mentioned in the description of the proposal on the application form, it is very clearly an intrinsic part of the development. Paragraph A1(k) of the GPDO sets out that development is not permitted if, *inter alia*, it would consist of or include the construction or provision of a verandah, balcony, or raised platform.
8. In order to benefit from the permitted development rights set out in the GPDO a proposed development must comply with all of the conditions and limitations set out in relation to that right. The appeal scheme does not meet the limitations set out in Paragraphs A1(i) and A1(k) Class A and, consequently, the works proposed would not be permitted development.

Conclusion

9. For the reasons given above the appeal should be dismissed.

Alison Scott

INSPECTOR